

September 15, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4819

letter, the Washington Report, my traveling office which holds individual conferences throughout the district, and opinion polls, such as the one I am inserting in today's Record, are most helpful to me in maintaining contact with those I represent.

The following opinion poll is being sent to the home of every registered voter in the district, 130,000 in all. I wish to emphasize that I do not use the results of the poll as a blueprint or as a political weathervane for voting on issues, but

I do derive much benefit from having the excellent comments and response it generates.

The poll follows:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN, WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,  
WOULD LIKE YOUR OPINION

SEPTEMBER, 1966.

On Capitol Hill, in the jungles of Southeast Asia, on the streets of our major cities, events are transpiring which are changing the face of history. This is a year of many fast-moving issues. The Minshall Opinion Poll taken in May was most helpful to me as your Representative in Congress. The re-

sults received nationwide acknowledgment. This Opinion Poll again is being mailed to the home of every registered voter in the 23rd District regardless of political affiliation and it deals in greater depth with some of the crucial issues of our times. The reverse side of the page is available for your individual comments. Time and staff limitations will not permit me to personally respond to every return, but each will be carefully read and tabulated. Results will be released to the news media and in a future newsletter. Please complete the questionnaire and return to: Minshall Opinion Poll, 2243 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C., 20515.

		Yes	No	No Opinion
VIETNAM				
1. Do you think the United States is making progress toward victory?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Which most nearly expresses your point of view? (Check only one):				
(a) Continue present policy		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Withdraw all U.S. forces immediately		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Limit military actions and intensify peace efforts		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Make all-out effort to win militarily without nuclear weapons		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Make all-out effort to win militarily including nuclear weapons		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Do you favor a stronger policy against countries trading with North Vietnam?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Should U.S. citizens be prohibited by law from giving aid to North Vietnam?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. What form of Selective Service System is preferable? (Check only one):				
(a) Present system		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Universal military training		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Lottery		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Lottery with limited deferments		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Should selected Reserves be called to active duty?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DOMESTIC ISSUES				
7. Are stronger civil rights laws needed?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Should there be a strong Federal antiriot law?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Do you think the war on poverty has been effective to date?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. To combat inflation, should the Federal Government:				
(a) Increase personal income taxes		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Increase corporate taxes		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Initiate wage-price controls		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Reduce Federal domestic spending		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Reduce military spending		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Do you favor laws to require disclosure of outside income and other assets by all public officials, including Members of Congress?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. As a result of the recent airline strike, do you favor new laws to prevent strikes which affect the national interest?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Is a multi-billion-dollar crash program desirable to combat air and water pollution?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. What do you think is the principal problem facing the Nation today?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Military Construction Appropriation Bill, 1967

SPEECH  
OF

HON. SPEEDY O. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 1966

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 17637) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of H.R. 17637, the appropriations for military construction for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have an opportunity to study the needs of our Nation's defense efforts and in the interest of national defense I earnestly support H.R. 17637. By approving this appropriation measure we are, once again, saying no to the spread of godless communism. We are approving funds to assist our servicemen and women to help prevent the spread of this malignant growth.

In my district, the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana, we have Fort Polk at Leesville and England Air Force

Base at Alexandria. We know the importance of national defense in our district because we are constantly reminded by the presence of these two installations.

Thank you for the opportunity to briefly express my support of H.R. 17637 and I can assure you of my continued support of our national defense.

## Commentary on Overall View of Conflict in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for inclusion in the Record a thoughtful commentary on an overall view of the current conflict in Vietnam. The article in Air Force/Space Digest by Technical Editor J. S. Butz, Jr., is written in such a manner that it represents a necessary pause in the emotion, misinformation, and controversy now surrounding the Vietnam conflict. Mr. Butz writes of three basic questions that need to be answered in any careful and realistic consideration of the conflict:

The war in Vietnam is escalating as a political issue faster than it is in a military

sense, and the swirl of ill-informed public argument continues to reduce the public's chances of understanding the true situation in Vietnam. Quite likely, a new level of emotionalism and confusion will be reached before election day in November, so it is appropriate to look back now, take stock, and try to establish the basic issues clearly.

Some aspects of this inventory are as unpleasant as they are undeniable. The big buildup of US military power, which began more than a year ago, has not yet ended the war. The bombing in the North and the interdiction of the Red supply lines to the South have intensified, but the North Vietnamese war effort appears undiminished. Victory is not in sight and no one holds out the hope of less than a long and costly war.

The congressional elections just ahead are going to be strongly influenced by these gloomy prospects, and most politicians still are approaching the issue gingerly. The majority are supporting President Lyndon B. Johnson's policy with reservations. The main opposition to the war currently is coming from a small group of Senators, a number of distinguished military and Far Eastern experts who presently are without government portfolio, and a broad segment of the syndicated press. This opposition is tireless, determined, and articulate. Currently, some of the more prominent spokesmen have escalated their arguments well beyond anything written last year. Logical discussion is being replaced by severe vituperation. For example, columnist Walter Lippmann, in a recent article in *Newsweek*, evangelizes that "the Administration has gone off whoring after false gods in the pursuit of world power." This is much more

A4820

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 15, 1966

than an isolated accusation that the US has become an unwelcome aggressor in Asia.

The most disturbing aspect of such talk is that it is certain to get much worse very soon. The costs of the Vietnamese War are rising. In recent months, the US has lost an average of 600 dead and wounded per week. If this trend continues, more than 60,000 additional casualties can be expected before the presidential election of 1968.

Attrition is taking a heavy toll in losses of aircraft over the North. Over the past few months an average of about one per day has been downed, which is more than twenty-five percent higher than last year. In one day, recently, twelve were lost. If this keeps up for another two years the war in the North will have consumed at least 1,000, and possibly 1,500, expensive strike fighters. By normal Pentagon cost-accounting procedures this represents a capital loss of \$3 billion to \$5 billion, if training of the pilots is counted. If the aircraft lost in noncombat accidents, fuel, spares, and other expendables are added, the total cost of air war in the North and against the supply lines in Laos will be pushing \$10 billion by the time the nation goes to the polls in 1968.

Unless there is a dramatic turn of events for the better, war policy will dominate the choice of our next President. The costs up to 1968 will be sobering enough. But, when the talk gets around to a ten- to twenty-year struggle, voters are going to get emotional. Casualties would run into the hundreds of thousands and expenditures to many, many billions. A ten-year conflict would cost more than twice what the Korean War cost in dollars and lives.

Two more years of hard fighting in Vietnam with no prospect of victory could be the most divisive issue in US politics in modern times. Even our two-party system could be fractionated. The basic tenets of our post-World War II foreign policy will come under strong attack, and the US might abdicate much of its leadership of free-world interests over large parts of the globe. Obviously, this is what Ho Chi Minh believes will happen if he perseveres and stays away from the conference table. Nothing would cheer world communism more.

The stage setting for a cataclysmic fight in US politics is virtually complete. The opportunities for demagoguery and distortion have seldom been more fertile. Political reputations can be built on the foundation of hard, unpleasant, and irrefutable facts of a long war of attrition, as already discussed. From there, the fire can be fueled with erudite discussions from experts who hold that the Vietnamese represent an alien culture that we can never fully understand, one which properly should be left to its own devices and its nearest neighbors.

Then the emotions can be brought to a white heat by painting almost any desired picture of treachery, criminal negligence, cowardice, thievery, brutality, political chicanery, rule by clique, or you name it. The South Vietnamese have been cited, correctly, in our press and by various Americans for all of these evils. Accusations against our own government in the press range from ineptness, stupidity, and the inability to choose proper friends, to conniving with the Vietnamese in murder, to indiscriminate bombing.

Few Americans have been able to avoid a severe state of uncertainty and confusion under the drumbeat of charges and countercharges between "hawks" and "doves," and those who want to "give-em-hell-and-get-it-over," and the proponents of a speedy but "honorable" pullout. In the not-too-distant future US voters are going to have to make up their own minds as to what policy is correct. Eventually all of them are going to have to take their own inventory on the basis of what they can read, hear, and see

about this complex situation half a world away.

On the basis of a ten-week trip to Vietnam during the first three months of this year, I have a suggestion for those trying to find answers. While one short trip does not make an expert, it did furnish an opportunity to travel in all four Corps Areas in the country, from Da Nang in the north to the Communist sanctuary of An Xuyen at the southern tip of the Delta. And it was possible to talk to dozens and dozens of people at all levels in the US and Vietnamese operations. One gets a very different picture of the war at close range.

One can simulate this close-range view in the US by remembering that the newspaper front pages most often do not reflect the "norm" in Vietnam any more than they do the typical situation in the United States. The unusual makes news anywhere, and this fact tends to confuse those who are trying to understand typical activity and feeling in any unfamiliar area. It is not uncommon for the bare facts on military operations and civil activity to be misinterpreted, not through malice but because of ignorance of the details.

By constantly remembering the limitations of our public-communications system, and by concentrating on understanding a few basic issues, one has a chance to reach a reasonable point of view on Vietnam.

Three basic questions must be answered. If one cannot answer them positively and resoundingly in the affirmative, the US policy is indeed on shaky ground. They are:

(1) Do the majority of the South Vietnamese people want US help?

(2) Is the US using its immense military power honorably, using it with proper restraint and avoiding unnecessary casualties in its military operations?

(3) Can a guerrilla army be defeated by relatively conventional forces, using the tactics now employed by the US?

My own belief is that each of these questions can be answered with a resounding yes. If this is true, it is possible to put most reports from Vietnam in proper perspective.

## DO THE VIETNAMESE WANT OUR HELP?

There are two main categories of Americans in Vietnam today. The most numerous type, by far, serves in major US units and has little opportunity to mix with the Vietnamese except in bars or haggling in the shops while on leave. These are the people who say that the Vietnamese cheat us, and run away in combat. These are the people who ask the question, "Why are we here?" Actually, there is little these men can do to avoid the tensions and bad feelings that traditionally spring up between large military units and the local population. Regardless of their performance in combat, these men are not a good source of information on this question. If one relied on young US troops to form an opinion of the English, French, Germans, or even the citizenry around large bases in the US, the opinion would be shockingly low.

The other category of American is in a much better position to know and evaluate the Vietnamese. These are the men of the Army Special Forces and the Army, Marine, and Air Force advisers who serve with Vietnamese units, accompany them in day-to-day operations, eat with them, sleep with them, fight with them, and all too often die with them.

One of the quickest ways to get a lecture is to ask one of these men why the South Vietnamese Army doesn't fight as well as the Viet Cong, or why the Vietnamese won't buckle down, forget their internal differences, and win the war if they are really anti-Communist.

No one pretends that there are no serious problems in the Saigon government, or in our management of our aid. No one looks upon the recent history of Vietnam as any-

thing but a series of tragedies. But there are degrees of tragedy, and it is clear that the vast majority of Americans who know the Vietnamese best (100 percent of the ones I talked to) and the vast majority of the South Vietnamese look upon a US withdrawal as the ultimate tragedy, which would transcend all that has gone before. These Americans believe that the South Vietnamese have given a good account of themselves under the circumstances, that they are eminently worthwhile people, and that there is hope for the future.

## IS THE U.S. USING ITS POWER HONORABLY?

No charge is quite so disturbing as that the US is engaged in indiscriminate bombing. A recent column by James Reston, the usually reliable New York Times columnist, is a good example of this widespread supposition. Reston said, "... [President Johnson] has been dropping more bombs on Vietnam for months than the monthly average of bombs dropped on Europe in the last World War, [and] he has convinced himself that this is a policy of 'great restraint.'"

The fact of the matter is that one cannot equate bombing tonnages being dropped in Vietnam to those of World War II. The equation would mean nothing. The towns and villages in Vietnam are not being demolished as cities were in Europe. There is very close control over the selection of targets. Only a small percentage of the bombs are dropped on villages or populated areas, and then usually after considerable debate, and much provocation. Warning is given by loudspeaker planes and leaflets before the attack. Forward Air Controllers (FACs) flying low and slow in small aircraft guide the strike fighters. Aerial ordnance has never been so closely controlled or so accurately delivered.

The major portion of the bombs are expended in forest and jungle areas. The first reaction of the visitor is that they are being wasted, and by World War II standards they certainly are. I saw considerable evidence of this fact in several flights with FACs. In the Quang Ngai area, for example, where the Viet Cong is strongly entrenched, VC territory begins a couple of miles west of the province capital. We flew back into lovely, prosperous-looking, green valleys, ten to twenty miles long and filled with farms and livestock. During more than six hours of flying in this area I saw no evidence of war except fortified Special Forces camps and burned-out government outposts that had been overrun by the VC. None of the Viet Cong villages showed signs of damage. The FACs I rode with directed air strikes, but all were against huts half-hidden in the jungle, or mountain trails running west into Laos.

Flights over the other sections of the country produced the same evidence. Anyone who believes that the populated areas of South Vietnam, either government- or VC-controlled, are being systematically or indiscriminately destroyed, is completely and totally wrong.

In the raids against the North it is widely supposed that the recent escalation involved more than bombing of oil-storage areas. *Newsweek*, for example, reported that ninety-five percent of all military targets in North Vietnam have been destroyed. This is grossly incorrect. The dock areas of Haiphong still are untouched. Only one large power-plant has been knocked out. The complex of factories near Hanoi and Haiphong has not been attacked. The warehouses and loading facilities for transshipment of goods are still operating.

No one claims that mistakes aren't made in wars as in other ventures, or that the stress of combat never produces excesses. However, the preponderance of evidence shows that the US has a policy of restraint that is being successfully implemented.

Can US Tactics Defeat the Viet Cong? According to many experts, the US has

poured so much air and ground strength into South Vietnam that the war has become a conventional rather than a guerrilla conflict. In any event, the Viet Cong victory, which appeared imminent at the beginning of 1965, has been thwarted and the Communists have been soundly defeated in a series of major battles. It is now impossible for the VC to undertake operations in the daylight with any real hope of success. Air strikes, which can be delivered on a few minutes' notice, have stopped this sort of operation. Heliborne troops are constantly pursuing enemy units, and their rest areas and storage points are being systematically demolished by B-52 strikes and ground action. It appears to be a matter of time before the main force VC and North Vietnamese units are eliminated.

These US operations do not fit the generally accepted methods of fighting guerrillas, as employed by the British in Malaysia for example, because the Army is not predominantly engaged in clearing areas, keeping them free of VC, and "pacifying" them. Final pacification is a police-type operation involving local security against terrorists, and programs to stimulate close cooperation between citizen and government, both economically and politically. The US is separating the military operations against the main enemy army units from pacification of the villages. South Vietnam will be an entirely different place when the Viet Cong main forces are defeated, and this appears to be possible within two years.

US tactics are new, because no nation has ever used large numbers of strike fighters and helicopters against guerrillas. There is every reason to believe that these tactics and this equipment will stop the Viet Cong armies and provide a reasonable chance to proceed with pacification.

Answering yes to all three of these questions presents an optimistic view of the war's final outcome. However, there can be no optimism about the final price. There is no easy shortcut. As long as this is not accepted by the majority of Americans, our growing losses are certain to trigger a major political upheaval eventually. In such a crisis, the facts of the Vietnamese situation could be obscured and the nation left at the mercy of misinformation and its emotions.

## Second Look Needed on Tax Move

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. CATHERINE MAY**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 15, 1966

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, considerable controversy is centering on President Johnson's proposal to suspend for 16 months the 7-percent investment tax credit for businesses.

David Lawrence has written a revealing and penetrating article on this subject and it appears in the Evening Star issue of September 14, 1966. I insert this article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the serious attention of my colleagues:

SECOND LOOK NEEDED ON TAX MOVE  
(By David Lawrence)

President Johnson, of course, intended his recommendation for a suspension of the investment tax credit as a constructive move to help stop inflation. But many businessmen see it as a maneuver that actually will retard economic growth.

Perhaps the best argument against removal

of the 7 percent investment tax credit was made by Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler himself in hearings just a few months ago before the Senate committee on finance. Here is what Fowler told the committee:

1. The credit "provides incentives for expansion and modernization of productive capacity."

2. It encourages "technological advance enabling the economy to increase productivity and thereby to deal with wage increases without price increases."

3. In this way, as well as "by making investment here more attractive, the credit helps us to deal with our balance of payments."

4. The credit isn't shortrange; instead it becomes available when a project is completed, and, "as a matter of good faith and fairness, a suspension would have to provide exception for projects already contracted for prior to the effective date. The real impact of suspension of the credit might not hit us for a year or so following effective date of the suspension."

5. Suspension of the credit "may hit the small plants hardest" because their investment programs usually are completed relatively fast.

6. Uneconomic "repair and maintenance of outmoded equipment" would tend to return.

7. Suspension would mean prompt curtailment of the very type of investment "which makes the most anti-inflationary contribution."

Many leaders in the heavy-goods industries are dismayed at the action taken by the government. They believe that Fowler himself didn't favor the change but was overruled by the President. Some of the ill effects of the removal of the 7 percent investment credit are explained by Charles M. Beeghly, chairman of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. He says that foreign competitors will welcome the move, as it gives them a competitive advantage. He describes the impact of the proposed legislation on his own company as follows:

"In our case we are involved in a major cost-reduction and plant-and-product-improvement program involving the expenditure of \$350 to \$400 million over the three-year period 1966-1968. The basic elements of this program are parts of an integrated whole, although they are spread over several plants in different states. They must be completed as a whole if they are to achieve their intended benefits. The timing of the individual commitments does not alter this fact. In line with the President's previous request to defer capital spending, we have moved ahead only where plans and commitments were such that we could not cut back.

"A large part of this program has been contractually committed, while other associated parts essential to the workability of the program have yet to be placed with suppliers. These committed projects and projects associated with them require up to two years or more for completion. Our financial planning for these programs took into account the cash which would be internally generated from all depreciation allowances and the investment tax credit with full reliance on statements of government spokesmen that these policies were regarded as a permanent part of the revenue code.

"A decision to legislate a reduction of such internally generated cash from these sources before the completion of these projects would necessitate reliance on additional bank credit or higher steel prices as new sources for needed funds."

In the steel industry, a two-year period of construction and installation is said to be common. Unless there is provision to permit commitments already made for construction to be carried out, the obligations incurred by many companies would have to be met by borrowing large sums of money.

Congress is bound to take a second look at the President's proposal, and pressure is likely to build up against making the suspension of credit retroactive. But the real damage will be done in halting the expansion necessary to get new equipment so as to be able to produce goods at lower prices—which is in itself an effective means of combating inflation.

## End of a Fiscal Gimmick

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. GERALD R. FORD**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 15, 1966

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, early this session when President Johnson proposed to pool certain assets of some governmental agencies and to sell participation certificates in these assets, Republicans objected strenuously to this gimmick to fool the public.

We pointed out that this was a gimmick by which it could be made to appear that our annual deficit was down and our national debt reduced all through the miracles of bookkeeping. We also stressed the point that the higher interest rates at which these participations could be sold would have an adverse effect on the money market.

We were, therefore, impressed with the editorial in the New York Times for September 13, 1966, entitled "End of a Fiscal Gimmick." This editorial is especially significant because it explains that what the Republicans predicted would happen has actually taken place.

We all know that the President's decision to halt the sale of participations and to reduce low-priority spending comes much too late. But I think the President's proposal and his entire message was, as the Times points out, "a sign that the administration may have finally realized that it cannot really be fiscally responsible so long as it indulges in financial gimmickry."

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the editorial:

### END OF A FISCAL GIMMICK

The Johnson Administration has finally wriggled off the hook of its design that has put painful pressure on the nation's money markets and harmed its own economic objectives.

The Johnson Administration is not in favor of tight and dear money. But its desire to make the budget deficit look smaller led it to forge a policy that effectively reinforced the Federal Reserve's monetary stringency. Instead of winning applause for fiscal ingenuity from the financial community the Treasury has been attacked for its fiscal mismanagement in contributing to the severe squeeze on credit. Experimentation and innovation in fiscal operations are of course sorely needed, but it is clear that the Administration's resort to this particular gimmick has definitely hurt, rather than helped, its own cause.

The hook was in the form of sales to the public of special types of Government securities, particularly participations in Federal-owned loans. These sales were originally billed as a measure of fiscal responsibility because they helped to reduce the deficit in the Federal budget. But coming at a time

A4822

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 15, 1966

when private demand for long-term funds was strong, the Treasury's trips to market to sell its participations helped to intensify the credit squeeze and drove up interest rates to very high levels.

Now the Treasury has announced that it is abandoning public sales of participations and will limit the marketings of securities sold by Federal agencies. This decision means that the Treasury will be stepping up its own direct borrowings, which may prevent an easing of short-term interest rates; it also may swell the Federal deficit and force the Treasury to go to Congress with a request to raise the ceiling on the national debt.

It has not been easy for the Administration to admit it was wrong, especially since reverting to its traditional practice will bring these new problems. But the Treasury has recognized that sticking to its financing gimmick to hold down the direct Federal deficit held much greater risks than getting rid of it. The fact is that the sales of Government participations have not only made interest rates higher than they would—or should—have been; they also proved extremely unsettling to the market, worsening an already turbulent and tense situation.

The postponement of sales, combined with the fiscal proposals made by President Johnson, have served to improve market conditions. Even more important, the decision is a sign that the Administration may have finally realized that it cannot really be fiscally responsible so long as it indulges in financial gimmickry.

### Minshall Again Brings Traveling Office to District

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 15, 1966

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 12 years it has been my privilege

and honor to represent the citizens of the 23d Congressional District of Ohio in the U.S. House of Representatives.

As the Representative of this outstanding district, I make every effort not only to keep well informed on the opinions of the people through personal contact, but also attempt to be of the greatest possible service to those who have problems involving Federal departments and agencies. To help accomplish this, I maintain a year-round congressional office in room 525 of the Federal Building in downtown Cleveland.

During my six terms in Congress I have made every effort to keep the people informed about the national scene. My newsletter, the Washington Report, periodically summarizes major legislative activities of the Congress and other issues confronting the Nation.

During my service in Washington, I have considered it of primary importance to be present at the Capitol whenever the Congress is in session in order to participate in committee work and to vote on legislation. Because of the intensive daily legislative and committee schedule last year and this, with Congress in almost continuous session, I have not been able to return to Cleveland as frequently as I would like.

My Appropriations Committee assignments are particularly time consuming. In addition to membership on the Department of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I also serve on the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, which encompasses the budgets of 22 important Federal agencies. Combined, my subcommittee responsibilities involve nearly two-thirds of the total national budget and of necessity require many hours of work in locked-door ses-

sions on Capitol Hill and on-the-spot committee investigations.

Because so much time must be spent in Washington, I initiated a practice 12 years ago of taking a traveling office to the various communities in the 23d district. This method of meeting with the public is tremendously popular and gives me an excellent opportunity to discuss and learn at first hand the opinions and individual needs of the people.

With the expectation that Congress will not be in session during the latter part of October this year, I will take the traveling office to the people of the 23d District during the week of October 24 to make myself available to meet personally every resident who can conveniently arrange to visit me.

I wish to emphasize that these are not group meetings but office conferences for individuals which will enable each person to discuss his or her views and problems privately with me.

No appointments are necessary and I not only welcome but urge individuals to meet with me on the date and at the scheduled location most convenient to them.

Every resident of the 23d District is cordially invited to sit down and talk over issues of national concern, to discuss any problems they may have which involve the Federal Government, or just to get better acquainted. The knowledge obtained from these meetings will enable me to better represent the people of the 23d District of Ohio in the Congress.

I am most grateful for the splendid cooperation of the many officials who are making meeting places available as an aid in rendering this public service.

Following is the traveling office schedule:

Community	Location	Date	Time (p.m.)
Lakewood	Lakewood City Hall, 12650 Detroit Ave.	Monday, Oct. 24	2 to 4:30.
Ward 4, Cleveland	George Washington School, 16210 Lorain Ave.	do.	6:45 to 9:30.
Rocky River, Bay Village, Fairview Park, North Olmsted, Parkview, Westlake	Rocky River City Hall, 21012 Hilliard Blvd.	Tuesday, Oct. 25	2 to 4:30.
Berea, Middleburgh Heights, Olmsted Falls, Olmsted Township, Parma Heights, Strongsville, Westview	Berea City Hall, 11 Tract St.	do.	6:30 to 9.
Brecksville, Broadview Heights, Independence, North Royalton, Seven Hills	Brecksville Town Hall, 49 Public Sq.	Wednesday, Oct. 26	2 to 4:30.
Ward 1, Cleveland	West Tech High School, 2201 West 93d St.	do.	6:45 to 9:30.
Warrensville Heights, North Randall, Orange, Warrensville Township, Woodmere	Warrensville Heights City Hall, 4301 Warrensville Center Rd.	Thursday, Oct. 27	2 to 4:30.
Chagrin Falls, Chagrin Falls Township, Bentleyville, Glenwillow, Moreland, Solon	Chagrin Falls Village Hall, 21 West Washington St.	do.	6:30 to 9.
Maple Heights, Bedford, Bedford Heights, Oakwood, Valley View, Walton Hills	Maple Heights City Hall, 5353 Lee Rd.	Friday, Oct. 28	2 to 4:30.
Beachwood, Hunting Valley, Pepper Pike	Beachwood City Hall, 25511 Fairmont	do.	6:30 to 9.

### Patriot in the Battle of Freedom

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 15, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the administration is pursuing a policy of embracing the Soviet Union, it is well for us to remember tragedies of history caused by Soviet duplicity.

A few weeks ago, Gen. Tadeusz Bor-Komorowski passed away in England, and his passing receives scant attention. Yet 22 years ago, he was a central figure in a heroic tragedy, of which Soviet duplicity was especially evident.

Therefore, I would like to give proper recognition to a patriot in the battle of freedom to remind my colleagues of the background and tragedy of Soviet foreign policy. I submit for the Record an article by Harry E. Dembowski which appeared in the September 10 issue of the Polish American of Chicago, Ill.:

#### IN MEMORIAM: A POLISH PATRIOT

(By Harry E. Dembowski)

American newspapers recently carried a short news item about General Tadeusz Bor-Komorowski: it was on the occasion of his death. The General died where he had lived these past twenty years, an exile in England.

What of this man? "Simply" this: his name is linked—and forever so—with one of the two or three most dramatic and tragic episodes in all of Polish history: the Warsaw Uprising of 1944. For this he is best known; for this he will be remembered.

Although known to the world as General Bor, his true surname was Komorowski.

September 15, 1966

A4824

country's rallying behind you in this crisis. You're up 48 points.

Elbie (happily): Oh, it's good to have faith in the polls once again. And the stock market?

Wild Bill: It went 32 points down, 27 points up and 17 points sideways.

Elbie (frowning): I was hoping to shake it out of its normal pattern. How is the State Department taking it?

Wild Bill: With horror, sir. Your orders for them not to issue a clarification paper caused three undersecretaries to attempt suicide by leaping out windows. Fortunately, in keeping with the spirit of the Department, they all chose ground floor windows.

Elbie: You can count on them. What about diplomatic circles?

Wild Bill: Absolute chaos, sir. Seventeen nations have withdrawn their ambassadors for instructions on how to deal with a country whose leader is not infallible. But they can't find any precedents. Meanwhile, seeing how well it's helped you at home, they're all trying to emulate you. De Gaulle claims he's been wrong three times.

Elbie: He's always bragging.

Wild Bill: And the Communists are really trying to outdo you. Kossygin's talking about bringing back Khrushchev, Mao Tse-tung's confessed he can't swim and Ho Chi Minh wants to negotiate. It looks, sir, like peace in our time.

Elbie (grandly): Well, I said I'd do anything for peace and I did it.

Wild Bill (admiringly): It must have taken a lot of courage, sir, to say in public that you were capable of human error.

Elbie (nodding): Yep. I never thought I'd get away with a whopper like that.

Well, tune in again, folks. And meantime, as you mosey down the trail of life, remember what Elbie's ol' granddaddy used to say: "You can always profit on your own mistakes. But it's a sight easier on someone else's."

### Negro Jobless Up—Why?

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, with the vast confluence of Federal programs now in operation to increase employment and decrease unemployment, this country still has been unable to substantially reduce unemployment among Negroes.

An article in the New York Times by Eileen Shanahan on September 11, 1966, discusses this serious problem. I commend it to my colleagues:

NEGRO JOBLESS UP—WHY?

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON, September 10.—With everything that has been done in the past few years to improve the lot of the Negro in America, is his job situation nevertheless actually getting worse?

So informed an expert as Arthur M. Ross, the head of the Government's Bureau of Labor Statistics, thinks that it is. Mr. Ross cites the unemployment figures compiled by the experts in his own agency to support his view that Negro workers in recent months have benefited neither from the specific efforts made in their behalf, nor from the general prosperity of the nation.

For all practical purposes, Negro unemployment has not budged this year. There are still nearly a quarter of a million Negroes

out of work and actively seeking jobs—the Government's definition of "unemployment."

But in one key sense, the job situation of the Negro has actually deteriorated over the past 12 months, and particularly over the past four. The Negro unemployment rate—the percentage of all those unable to find work as compared to the total number of Negro workers—has been rising. At the same time, the white unemployment rate has been falling or remained at the least, stable.

As far back as the statistics go on unemployment by race, which is to 1948, Negroes have always had a disproportionate share of unemployment. Their rate of unemployment has been, generally, a bit more than twice as large as the white rate, in good times or bad. When 3½ per cent of the white persons who wanted work were jobless, somewhat more than 7 per cent of the Negroes were unemployed. When the rate for whites leapt up to 6 per cent, for example, in a recession, the Negro rate went above 12 per cent.

The ratio has been remarkably constant. Labor Department figures, taken on a quarterly rather than a monthly basis to smooth out some of the meaningless gyrations in monthly statistics, show this. Since 1957 (which is simply as far back as this particular set of figures go) the ratio of Negro to white unemployment has almost always moved in the narrow range of 1.9 to 2.2 times as large, of the total of 39 calendar quarters covered by these figures, there are only three in which the rate was outside this range. Twice the Negro unemployment rate rose to 2.3 times the white rate and once to 2.4 times.

In July and August of this year the ratio again hit 2.4. The problem is that nobody knows why.

Experts have no one explanation for the rise, but studies of Negro unemployment patterns would make one thing certain. The current rise does not reflect a white backlash to the recent Negro protest movement.

There is a possibility that the figures are, for some reason, inaccurate and that in another couple of months the alarm that was raised by Mr. Ross will prove to have been a false one. This is what some of Mr. Ross' own experts in the Bureau of Labor Statistics believe. There have been similar alarms in the past, which have proved unfounded.

The statistics could be wrong, the experts agree, because of the manner in which they are gathered. The Labor Department's unemployment figures are based on a sample that is supposed to be representative of the entire population. Only 3,500 households are covered by the sample, however, and while this is a huge sample, as statistical sampling techniques go, it is still very small for purposes of identifying the unemployed by subcategory, such as race. Negroes now constitute about one-ninth of the U.S. population, and thus the sample is only one-ninth Negro, a small number.

The possibility of sampling errors aside, the long-term trends in Negro unemployment are somewhat mystifying to the experts. They do not move precisely with the trend in white unemployment, nor against it. While Negro unemployment, like white unemployment, does go up in booms and down in recessions, the relationship between the two does not seem to be particularly influenced by business cycles.

Common sense would hold that Negroes being "last hired, first fired" would be hurt relatively more than whites in recessions and helped relatively more by booms. But the statistics do not support this bit of common sense.

It is the failure of the present boom, of unprecedented length in peacetime, to sop up a greater proportion of Negro unemployment that has alarmed Mr. Ross and those who share his views. It looked for a while,

in 1965, that the gap between Negro and white unemployment was narrowing and this was taken as a sign that a prolonged boom would, indeed, ultimately help Negroes more than whites. It now turns out that it hasn't—this much is completely clear. Whether the relative position of the Negro has actually been worsened remains to be seen when further statistics are available.

Even if the Negro's job position is essentially unchanged as a result of the long boom—an unemployment rate a bit more than twice the white rate—this presents some serious policy questions. If an unprecedented boom will not narrow the gap, what will?

### VN Vietnam Questionnaire Results

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 14, 1966

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am announcing the results of the special questionnaire on Vietnam which was included in my most recent "Report from Washington" mailed to all registered voters in Ohio's 11th District.

The 5,500 replies I received reflect the grave concern of the citizens of the 11th District over the war in Vietnam. Many people wrote additional comments and separate letters all of which I read with great interest.

In response to the question "Do you favor bombing North Vietnam cities, including Hanoi, Port of Haiphong and main railroads leading to Red China?" 64.5 percent voted for, 24 percent against and 11.5 percent had no opinion. It should be noted that many of those who support increased bombing attacks also made it clear that they opposed the indiscriminate bombing of civilian populations.

One of the highest favorable percentages was in support of blockading North Vietnamese ports. A strong majority—70.6 percent—indicated that they want to see the administration take this course of action while 18.7 percent opposed this option and 10.7 failed to register their viewpoint on this question.

The computer tabulation shows that over a third of those responding in the 11th District—34.6 percent—favor a gradual, complete withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam, while 55.4 percent voted against this proposal and 10 percent of the people expressed no opinion.

No question drew a more united response than the one suggesting the suspension of foreign aid to those allies who trade with North Vietnam. It appears that the citizens of northeastern Ohio are fed up with the administration's policy of giving assistance to countries who turn around and aid our enemies by trading with them, for 81.3 percent favored suspension of foreign aid to these nations.

The concept of a coalition government in South Vietnam which would include the Vietcong is apparently not a familiar one as 25.7 percent of the respondents did not reply to this question or indi-



September 15, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4823

"Bor" was a pseudonym, the Polish word for "forest", for it was from deep forests that he fought against the Germans throughout most of the World War.

General Komorowski was born in Eastern Poland near Lwow, the son of a farmer. In 1916 he joined an underground military organization and was wounded while fighting for Warsaw's liberation from the Germans in 1918. After his recuperation he entered the Polish Army and upon graduation from the School of Cavalry in Saumur, France, was made a Lieutenant Colonel.

In 1939, during the Polish-German campaign, Komorowski, as a full colonel, commanded a cavalry brigade. When the fighting ended he assumed the name "Bor" and became an organizer of Polish Underground units. General Sikorski appointed him second in command to the Commander of the Polish Home Army, General "Grot."

When General Grot was captured in Warsaw by the Germans in 1943, "Bor" automatically assumed the duties of commander of the Home Army, which was confirmed by General Sikorski shortly before his tragic death. A reward of 10 million zlotys (equivalent to almost two million dollars) was soon promised to the Germans to anyone capturing General Komorowski alive. So important was he considered to the enemy.

We come now to August 1, 1944 and the Warsaw Uprising. All which preceded this event in the life of Komorowski was a mere Prelude; all which would follow, a mere Epilogue.

At 5 p.m. that day in August the Polish forces, numbering 35,000 front-line fighters and 7,000 auxiliary troops, began an open fight for the liberation of Warsaw. The explosion of a mine laid under the premises of German military headquarters provided the signal.

The West greeted the news hopefully. Warsaw, a city of 1,250,000 inhabitants, was the first Allied capital approached by Soviet Armies—who were now only a few miles away, practically in the suburb of Praga—and the Uprising would help the Allied cause.

In its first days the Uprising was eminently successful: during the initial 24 hours, four districts of the city were occupied by the Poles, including the electric power station and the gas works. Within a week 40% of the city was theirs. A "Home Council of Ministers" was established, representing the London Government-in-Exile, and decrees were issued proclaiming the resumption of local self-government.

Gradually, however, because of the sudden halting of the Soviet Army, its refusal to help the Poles in way, and Stalin's refusal to permit the Western Allies to airlift assistance via Russian landing strips, the Uprising was crushed 63 days after it began. Bor was captured, the Polish population—those who still survived—were forcibly evacuated by the Germans, and Warsaw was leveled to the ground.

So much for the barbaric Germans. Equally atrocious, though of a different nature, were the actions of the Russians (namely: Stalin) and the Polish Communist quislings.

Despite the broadcasts of "Radio Kosciuszko" (actually: "Radio Moscow") which encouraged the Uprising and promised aid, once the fighting began the Communists first denied its existence; then minimized it, claiming it was militarily "futile"; and finally, worst of all, began a vicious propaganda campaign against General Bor-Komorowski and Warsaw's fighting men.

The Soviet Press called Bor "an agent provocateur" and "a dirty adventurer." The Communist "Lublin Committee" (destined to become the future Communist Government of Poland—of which Gomulka was a prominent member) went even further. It called the Polish Home Army "traitors, ban-

dits, incorrigible malefactors and brawlers" and threatened to bring Bor to trial as "a criminal and a traitor."

The Lublin Committee had no chance to fulfill its threats since Bor, at the Uprising's end, was a German prisoner of war. Later he was released from a prison camp by the advancing Western armies. The tightening Communist stranglehold on his homeland prevented his return... and so he remained, an exile, in England.

General Bor-Komorowski, in view of his heroic services on behalf of the Fatherland, has clearly earned a place in the Pantheon of Polish Patriots—those gallant men who, over the course of ten centuries, have led their countrymen in the struggle for national independence.

It is ironic that this patriot had to spend the last twenty years of his life in exile while the "quislings" remain in control of the Fatherland... ironic, but not unusual. For other patriots have likewise been fated to exile. Remember the great Kosciuszko?

The word "patriot" has come to have a disdainful meaning in certain intellectual circles. Nonetheless, for many of us, it is still a term of pride. Tadeusz Bor-Komorowski was a patriot in the best and truest sense of the word. For this he will be remembered; for this what more need be said?

## Two Columns by Arthur Hoppe

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 15, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the satirist Arthur Hoppe recently published two columns, one in the San Francisco Chronicle on Friday, September 9, entitled "A Little Corner of Old Vietnam" and the second column, about the L.B.J. family, appeared in the Washington Star of September 14. Both columns follow: [From the San Francisco Chronicle, Sept. 9, 1966]

### A LITTLE CORNER OF OLD VIETNAM

(By Arthur Hoppe)

FORT ORD.—Join the Army and learn a trade, I say. Today's Army offers training in a wide range of specialties to prepare young men for useful careers in civilian life. For example, you can join the Army and learn how to build an authentic Vietnamese village.

Where our young men are learning to build an authentic Vietnamese village is way out in the dusty boondocks of this sprawling training command.

You drive for miles on a dirt road, round a bend, and there they are—rice paddies! Just like in Vietnam.

"Of course, we don't have any water in them yet," said an officer apologetically. "In fact, we're having a little problem because we don't have any water piped out here. But we may bring it in by tanker truck. And anyway," he said, "they'll be nice and mucky for the troops from November through March."

I inquired what the Army would do with the rice it harvested. He laughed. "Oh, we're not going that far," he said. And knowing the Army you can see the wisdom of this. For, sure enough, the Provost Marshal would come along and put up signs saying, "Keep off the Rice!"

Anyway, from the riceless paddies, the road leads up a knoll to where the authentic

Vietnamese village sits under a cluster of oak trees, guarded by a stockade of oak limbs wired together and a large sign saying: "Keep Out"—a defense the Viet Cong has not yet thought of.

But a nice young sergeant said we could come in and look around. Inside the stockade were a dozen authentic straw-thatched huts, the straw having been scrounged from neighboring ranchers. A score of soldiers were hammering, sawing, digging, and, inevitably, looking on.

Stepping into one of the authentic huts, I found it had a plywood roof and walls to which the straw had been tacked. Plywood? "Well," said the sergeant with a grin, "it's authentic plywood. And look here," he said, pulling up a section of the plywood floor. "This trap door leads down into a tunnel. We dug 3600 feet of tunnels running every which way under the whole village."

I said that much labor certainly showed dedication. "Yeah," said the sergeant, "we got a trench digger in, roofed the ditches with two-by-twelves and covered them over with dirt."

The officer explained that the whole village would be booby-trapped and defended by troops in black-dyed fatigues and coolie hats. Soldiers in advanced training would then be given the job of flushing them out of the maze of tunnels and sniper platforms built in the trees.

I said, gosh, I could make a fortune selling plans to the tunnels to the attacking troops. "No," said the sergeant with a grin, "everybody knows where we dug them."

Well, I'm sure that, as the officer said, the Vietnamese village will prove "an invaluable training aid" to our troops. And it's already proved an invaluable training aid to the men constructing it.

I say this after looking down a well in the middle of the village to find a private at the bottom, slowly slapping wet concrete around the edges of a trap door. I inquired politely if he felt he was preparing himself for a useful career in civilian life.

"Yeah," he said with that age-old expression of any soldier stuck with an unhappy task, "I can always be a Viet Cong."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 14, 1966]

### TRYING A WHOPPER IN PEACE BID

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Howdy there, folks. How y'all? Time for another tee vee visit with the rootin'-tootin' Jay Family, starring ol' Elbie Jay—an open-hearted feller always willin' to admit a mistake. No matter what Republican made it.

As we join up with ol' Elbie today, he's holdin' one of his regularly scheduled tee-vee press conferences, which he regularly schedules every couple of years or so. And, my, he sure has got a wily look in his eye.

Elbie: . . . And let me say again that I'd go anywhere and do anything in the cause of peace. Anything, mind you, anything.

Reporter: Then why, sir, did you escalate the war in Viet Nam?

Elbie: I'm glad you asked that question, son. I want to take this opportunity to tell the whole world that . . . (He pauses, chokes, sputters and finally manages to speak in a barely audible whisper) . . . I was wrong!

There is a moment of stunned silence. Then, as one man, the reports rush for their telephones. Later, Elbie and his trusty top hand, Wild Bill Moyers, are analyzing the results.

Wild Bill: Congratulations on your historic first, sir. You captured banner headlines in all the dailies and every national magazine is saluting you as the first leader in world history ever to admit he was wrong.

Elbie: Never mind the trimmings. What about the polls?

Wild Bill: Just as you predicted, sir, the

cated that they did not understand this proposal. Of those answering, 32.3 percent favored such a government and 42 percent opposed it.

Perhaps the most significant statistics are those in reply to the last question, "Do you feel the administration is giving the public adequate information concerning Vietnam?" Sixty-nine percent answered in the negative. Further testimony to this feeling was provided by

the countless number of questionnaires that were returned without a single response and a notation stating that the individual did not feel he had sufficient information to answer the questions. Less than a fourth of the voters thought they had adequate information—22.4 percent—and 8.6 percent expressed no opinion.

We made no attempt to break down the replies by county, but postmarks in-

dicated a cross section of the 11th District is represented in this final tabulation. In talking with colleagues who sent out similar questionnaires to their districts in different parts of the country, I realized that we had an unusually high percentage of respondents. I am proud to represent an area with so many conscientious citizens who took the time to give me their views on this vitally important problem.

Final computer tabulation of Ohio's 11th District Vietnam questionnaire

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. In the light of our current position in South Vietnam, do you favor—			
(a) Bombing North Vietnam cities, including Hanoi, port of Haiphong, and main railroads leading to Red China?.....	64.5	24.0	11.5
(b) Blockading North Vietnamese ports?.....	70.6	18.7	10.7
(c) Gradual, complete withdrawal of our troops?.....	34.6	55.4	10.0
(d) Suspending foreign aid to those allies who trade with North Vietnam?.....	81.3	11.1	7.6
(e) A coalition government in South Vietnam?.....	32.3	42.0	25.7
2. Do you feel the administration is giving the public adequate information concerning Vietnam?.....	22.4	69.0	8.6

## Snatching Defeat From Victory

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the editorial department of television station WBBM in Chicago has consistently tried to place the proper focus on the whole question of demonstrations in Chicago this summer.

This station's most recent editorial telecast on September 6 again illustrates what a strong fight for good and what an impressive public service WBBM-TV is performing for the people of Chicago.

The penetrating editorial follows:

### SNATCHING DEFEAT FROM VICTORY

A cheap publicity stunt just may cost the Chicago civil rights movement much of the ground it has won.

The stunt was Sunday's so-called freedom demonstration in Cicero, pulled off by a renegade defector from the main civil rights body and a handful of followers.

It accomplished nothing, it destroyed much. It could well have turned into a bloody riot if nearly three thousand Illinois National Guardsmen had not been on hand. The presence of the Guardsmen, by the way, cost you, as taxpayers, about \$80,000. That was money well spent if the presence of the Guard prevented the loss of even one life, as it undoubtedly did. But it was money that need not have been spent, and would not have been spent save for a cheap publicity stunt by those who persisted in making the demonstration march.

One small irony of Sunday's publicity stunt was that the man who led it, Robert Lucas, is an employee of the United States government, a postal worker. At least he was until recently when he failed to show up for work.

A greater irony is that the Chicago Freedom Movement, which recently won major concessions from the city on open housing, allowed the splinter group's march to take place.

Earlier demonstration marches to protest segregated housing this summer have been non-violent, although some of them managed to provoke violent reactions.

Sunday's invasion of Cicero was not non-violent. The Negro marchers shouted threats and obscenities at white hecklers, and frequently hurled back bottles and stones which had been thrown at them.

There was no damage to the town of Cicero, except perhaps to its dignity.

But there was considerable damage to the cause of civil rights . . . and civil rights leaders should be fully aware of the necessity of avoiding further damage through any more such publicity stunts.

(Presented by Carter Davidson, Editorial Director of WBBM-TV.)

## A. G. Haley, Early Advocate of Outer Space Rule of Law

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 11, this Nation lost one of its prime movers in the worlds of communications and aerospace. Mr. Andrew J. Haley passed on following surgery in Georgetown University Hospital.

Mr. Haley, in a chosen field, dealt with neither material things nor technology. He dealt with people; he motivated them and stimulated them to greater achievements. As past president of the International Aeronautical Federation and its general counsel, he worked tirelessly in a great personal sacrifice to invigorate and focus the interest of scientists and political leaders in every part of the world on the tremendous progress the exploration of space could bring to humanity.

He was one of the world's outstanding specialists in communications law and later was in the forefront in the attempt to develop a judicial code governing the use of space and its exploration by all nations.

I feel sure that the memory of this

man will long be with us who are so deeply involved in our national space program and surely the impress of his influence will long be visible as mankind ventures further into the outer reaches of space.

For the benefit of the Members who perhaps did not know him as well as the Members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, I include at this point an account of Mr. Haley's impressive career as contained in the September 12 issue of the Washington Post:

### A. G. Haley, Early Advocate of Outer Space Rule of Law

Andrew G. Haley, pioneer in communications law and senior partner in the law firm of Haley, Bader and Potts, died after surgery for a perforated ulcer yesterday at Georgetown University Hospital.

Mr. Haley, 61, was an early advocate of the rule of law in outer space and author of the concept of "metalaw," to govern the conduct of terrestrial beings in outer space. Mr. Haley was a scientist and lawyer with a broad background of participation in international scientific and legal conferences on space and mass communications. He was co-founder and president of Aerojet, one of the world's largest rocket companies.

Born in Tacoma, Wash., he received a law degree from Georgetown University in 1928 and a certificate for studies in international law and historical jurisprudence from the Cambridge University.

Mr. Haley started his career as a newspaper writer at age 14, and after coming to Washington in 1924 contributed articles to magazines including Commonwealth and America, as well as law journals.

As an aide to the late Sen. C. C. Dill of Washington, Mr. Haley did research on communications legislation that provided a background for his work as counsel to the Federal Radio Commission and its successor, the Federal Communications Commission, from 1933 to 1939.

Entering private practice in 1939, Mr. Haley specialized in communications law. During World War II he was called to active duty as Chief of the Military Affairs Division of the Office of the Air Judge Advocate. He later served as co-founder and war-time president of Aerojet.

Mr. Haley returned to his private law practice after the war and continued to participate in development of the American space program and to work for international cooperation in space. The basis of his "meta-

law" system of extraterrestrial law was: "Do unto others as you would be done unto."

In 1957, shortly after Russia orbited the Sputnik satellite, he stepped up his campaign for declaring the moon "a free and independent autonomous area" to keep it from becoming a source of international friction.

At the time he made the above statement, he was president of the International Astronautical Federation (IAF) in which he participated actively and as an officer for many years.

In 1958, Mr. Haley was chairman of the first colloquium on the "Law of Outer Space" held at the Hague. He was a member of the permanent legal committee of the IAF and vice chairman of the Committee on Space Law of the American Bar Association.

A former president of the American Rocket Society, he was active in that organization for many years, receiving in 1954 an award "in appreciation for distinguished service and untiring efforts . . ."

He has traveled around the United States and the world lecturing on international cooperation in outer space and participating in conferences on space law. At the time of his death he was general counsel to the IAF, counsel and fellow of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, IAF observer to the United Nations, academicien of the International Institute of Space Law.

He was a member or fellow of numerous foreign legal and space organizations and received awards from the British Interplanetary Society and the International Grotius Foundation for Propagation of the Law of Nations.

Mr. Haley was the author of a book, "Space Law and Government," published in 1964.

#### LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

##### CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

**TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.**—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

**TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.**—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to

alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or

print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.